



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,850	10/10/2000	Marjorie Mossman Peffly	8287	4193

27752 7590 02/21/2003

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION  
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161  
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE  
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER	
BENNETT, RACHEL M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,850

Applicant(s)

PEFFLY ET AL.

Examiner

Rachel M. Bennett

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 and 53-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 and 53-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 18.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The examiner acknowledges receipt of the Supplemental IDS filed 12/3/02.

#### ***Terminal Disclaimer***

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/3/02 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of Application 09/685,536 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

#### ***Specification***

2. Claims 1-46, 53-69 are pending.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/3/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132**

The Declaration of Marjorie Mossman Peffly filed under 37 CFR 1.132 has been entered and considered but does not overcome the rejections. The examiner does not see any unexpected nature of the results from the data presented in the Declaration. Furthermore, the scope of the claims is broader than that of the results presented in the declaration in terms of 1) generic volatile liquid and its upper limit 99% by weight and 2) that of the generic liquid humectant and its lower limit of 0.1% with regard to 1). Instant claim 1 recites 99% as the upper limit and it is known that ethanol is a delipidizing agent and at this level of ethanol, Applicant has not shown that 0.1% of glycerol would moisturize the skin. The examiner cites the reference of Jampani et al. (US 5997893), which shows that ethanol deplipidizes the skin (see col. 1), in this context.

Art Unit: 1615

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-12, 15-18, 21-32, 35-38, 53-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara et al. (US 4940578).

Yoshihara discloses a hair preparation comprising an oil-absorptive substance and an anti-dandruff agent (see abstract). The base of the hair preparation is a mixture of water and ethanol (see col. 6 lines 20-26). The anti-dandruff agent is zinc pyrithione (see col. 8 and examples). The hair preparation may also contain other ordinary components in such amounts that they do not damage the effect of the preparation. The components include surfactants, humectants, and vitamins (see col. 6 lines 36-46 and col. 10 lines 54-58). The scalp lotion is applied after shampooing and drying the scalp with a towel (see col. 12 lines 63-68 and col. 13 lines 1-7). Yoshihara is deficient in the sense that this reference fails to teach the combination of all the above elements combined in a specific example.

It is the position of the examiner that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention, by routine experimentation, to combine the elements taught by the reference into one composition, determining the preferred amount of each component as desired by applicant to achieve the desired results. The reference desires a scalp composition comprising an anti-dandruff agent. The expected result would be a scalp composition comprising ethanol, zinc pyrithione and a humectant.

**Rejection under 103(a) over Yoshihara et al.**

Applicants argue the Declaration of Marjorie Mossman Peffly filed under 37 CFR 1.132 overcomes the rejection. The examiner disagrees for reasons stated above. Furthermore, the scope of the claims is broader than the scope of the Declaration. The Declaration is limited to 5% glycerine. The claims are not limited by glycerine or a by 5% of glycerine. The instant claims also have "further comprising" ingredients.

It is the position the examiner it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to "add other ordinary components", (as suggested by Yoshihara) such as humectants, specifically glycerol or dipropylene glycol to the scalp treatment in order to provide moisturization. Humectants, by definition, are substances that promote retention of moisture. Therefore, by adding humectants, as suggested by Yoshihara, moisturization of the scalp would be obtained.

6. Claims 13, 19, 20,33, 39, and 40 are rejected under rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashibuchi et al. (US 5565207).

Kashibuchi discloses a scalp moisturizer comprising an active ingredient (see abstract). Alcohols may be included in the composition (see col. 6). The moisturizer may contain additional active ingredients such as zinc pyrithione, menthols, surfactants, allantoin, vitamin E. Humectants may also be included (see col. 6). Kashibuchi discloses the following tests: A) test for recovery of regularity of cellular arrangement of scalp corneocytes and for the improvement in multi-layer desquamation; B) visual observation of scalp lesions and C) test for hair

Art Unit: 1615

in multi-layer desquamation; B) visual observation of scalp lesions and C) test for hair moisturizing effect. Kashibuchi is deficient in the since that this reference fails to teach the combination of all the above elements combined in a specific example.

It is the position of the examiner that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time of invention, by routine experimentation, to combine the elements taught by the reference into one composition, determining the preferred amount of each component as desired by applicant to achieve the desired results. The reference desires a scalp composition comprising an allantoin, vitamin E and menthol and alcohols. The expected result would be a composition comprising an active ingredient to be applied to the scalp.

**Rejection under 103(a) over Kashibuchi et al.**

Applicants argue Kashibuchi et al. does not teach a volatile liquid in combination with a humectant and skin active agent and Kashibuchi teaches away from the use of large amount of humectants. However, the examiner refers to the teaching of Kashibuchi at col. 6 lines 10-16, 48-57 where other ingredients such as alcohols may be incorporated into the scalp moisturizer. Also, at col. 6 lines 45-47, humectants may also be incorporated into the scalp moisturizer. Applicant is claiming the amount of humectant be from about .01% to 20%, more preferably from about 1% to about 10%. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to use a lower amount of humectant, as desired by the reference and applicant, in order to achieve the desired results claimed by applicant.

7. Claims 14, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara et al. (US 4940578) and further in view of McKay (US 5325878).

Art Unit: 1615

Yoshihara, as disclosed above, teaches a scalp composition. Yoshihara does not teach the composition be contained in an applicator. McKay is relied on for the teaching of an applicator comprising a matrix comprising a hair agent (see abstract and figures).

It is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to use the teachings of McKay with regard to using an applicator to apply a composition to the scalp in the teachings of Yoshihara because McKay teaches a hair composition as in Yoshihara. Both Yoshihara and McKay desire the composition to be applied to the hair and scalp. The expected result would be an applicator comprising a scalp composition.

8. Claims 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara et al. (US 4940578) and McKay and in further in view of Kellett et al. (US 5002075).

Yoshihara, as disclosed above, teaches a scalp composition. McKay as disclosed above, teaches a fluid-dispensing comb to apply a composition. Yoshihara does not teach an insecticidal agent in the composition. Kellett is relied on for the teaching of an applicator comprising a matrix comprising a hair-conditioning agent, specifically an insecticidal agent (see col. 13) and a surfactant (see abstract and figures).

It is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to use the teachings of Kellett with regard to using an insecticidal agent in a scalp composition in the teachings of Yoshihara and McKay because Kellett teaches a hair composition applied with an applicator as in Yoshihara and McKay. The expected result would be an applicator comprising a scalp composition for treating fleas and ticks.

Art Unit: 1615

**Rejection under 103 (a) over Yoshihara et al. in view of McKay (and in further view of Kellett)**

Applicants argue the reference does not teach the fluid be applied to the scalp but the hair. It is the position of the examiner that the composition of Yoshihara, as being applied to hair would simultaneously be applied to the scalp. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to use the composition taught by Yoshihara in the applicator taught by McKay because of the expectation of delivering the composition to the hair and the scalp.

Applicants also argue the comb of McKay would unduly affect hair cosmetics. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the applicator not unduly affecting hair cosmetics) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

***Art of Interest***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jampani et al. (US 5997893) is cited for the teaching of ethanol as a delipidizing agent.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



Art Unit: 1615

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

*Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel M. Bennett whose telephone number is (703) 308-8779. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3592 for regular communications and (703) 309-7924 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

R. Bennett  
February 12, 2003

*LSH*  
Shawn S. Moore, PhD  
Primary Examiner  
2/12/03